

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application, claims 1, 6 and 13 having been amended herein.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnunen et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,531,396, in view of Heymanns, U.S. PatentNo. 4,877,196. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's representative appreciates the Examiner taking the time to speak about the case. We appreciate that the Examiner stated that these amendments could place the case in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Heymanns teaches a screwlike or helical configuration of the groove pattern on the rider roll as described in column 2, lines 18-23, and as shown in Fig. 1." Specifically, Heymanns discloses that the grooves are formed advantageously extending over the **total breadth** of the rider roll." Col. 2, lines 22-23. Even more specifically, Heymanns discloses grooves "which extend over the **entire breadth** of the roll...and extend over the **entire breadth** of the roll." Col. 4, lines 3-8. Therefore, as shown by the description and Fig. 1 of Heymanns, the spiral grooves extend **continuously, along the total, entire breadth of the rider roll**. This is very different from what is required by Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 6 and 13. For example, Applicant's amended independent claim 1 requires "a substantially spiral-shaped

groove pattern (204) has been formed between the multiple deep guide grooves (203), and which extends across the axial width (l) of the roll mantle." Therefore, Applicant's claims require that the spiral grooves not extend continuously, along the total, entire breadth of the rider roll as disclosed by Heymanns. In Applicant's invention, the spiral grooves are only placed between the deep guide grooves and not along the total, entire breadth of the rider roll.

According to Applicant's invention, it is not possible to use the groove pattern extending along the entire breadth of the rider roll as taught by Heymanns because 1) high guide portions (deep guide grooves (203)) are needed for guiding the belts, and 2) a spiral-shaped groove pattern (204) is needed for removal of air. The deep guide grooves (203) are necessary so that the belts will maintain their alignment. Therefore, it would be impossible to manufacture the apparatus without proper guide grooves.

Therefore, it is submitted that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Kinnunen et al. with the teachings of Heymanns in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Even if the references were combined, they still do not obviate Applicant's invention as defined by the amended claims.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-12 and 14-19 depend from independent claims 1, 6 or 13 and are allowable for the same reasons discussed above.



Appl. No. 09/673,981
Amdt. Dated November 12, 2003
Reply to Office Action of July 11, 2003

990.1240

Conclusion


In view of the above amendments it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and should be removed and the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

This Amendment is being filed with a one-month extension. In the event that any additional extension and/or fee is required for the entry of this amendment the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: 
Martin G. Raskin
Reg. No. 25,642

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768-3800

RECEIVED
DEC 03 2003
GROUP 3600